

### Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-8, 10-16, 18, and 20-21 are amended, claims 2-3, 9, 17, and 19 are canceled, and claims 22-23 are added. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., page 13, lines 5-21; page 16, line 7 to page 18, line 4), figures (e.g., FIGS. 2-3), and claims and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-8, 10-16, 18, and 20-21 are pending.

#### Allowable Subject Matter:

Claim 17 was objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim 1, but was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge this indication of allowability and have incorporated dependent claim 17 into independent claim 1.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleged that claims 1, 18, and 21 were Single Means Claims. This rejection is moot in view of the amendments to the claims presented herewith.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicants regard as the invention. The Office Action alleged that “ ‘an article’ is an apparatus which does not comprise of ‘signal-bearing media’ ”. Applicants respectfully submit that an article of manufacture may comprise, for example, a magnetic, electrical, optical, biological, or atomic data storage medium (page 20, lines 6-11). Examples of such claim language are found in U.S. Patent 7,382,734, U.S. Patent 7,346,070, and U.S. Patent 6,879,454.

Withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-17 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is moot in view of the amendments to the claims presented herewith and the arguments presented for the “article” claim language presented above.

Withdrawal of the § 101 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they failed to show alphabetic components as described in the specification. The replacement drawing sheets presented herewith include text labels for the applicable structural details in the figures and description.

Withdrawal of the drawing objections is therefore respectfully requested.

#### Double Patenting

Claims 1-21 were provisionally on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/698,327.

Applicants submit herewith an executed Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate A Double Patenting Rejection Over a Prior Patent PTO/SB/25, citing Application No. 10/698,327 which is commonly-owned with the subject application. Withdrawal of the nonstatutory double patenting rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Erev et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0084106; "Erev"). This rejection is respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action's citations to the applied references, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Office Action's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest the first application server component, first switch component, second application server component, and second switch component that cooperate to route the call between the first network and the second network, as recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

For explanatory purposes, applicants discuss herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and the Office Action's citations to Erev. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Office Action's citations to Erev correspond to the claimed invention.

Erev (abstract) discloses a system and method for sending time-related multi-media contents (MMC) over an e-mail system. The MMC themselves are temporarily stored in a media store while a reference to the storage (e.g. URI) is attached to the e-mail message, or embedded therein. The method is implementable as automatic processes in e-mail clients and e-mail servers. Erev is directed towards a different problem of sending multimedia messages through e-

mail and fails to make any mention of an application server, switch component, or routing a call between networks. Erev fails to disclose the first application server component, first switch component, second application server component, and second switch component that cooperate to route the call between the first network and the second network.


Accordingly, the Office Action's citation to Erev fails to satisfy at least one of the limitations recited in applicants' independent claim 1.

For all the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1, claims 1, 18, and 21 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 18, and 21, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

Withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: July 8, 2008

Patti, Hewitt & Arezina, LLC  
Customer Number 47382